DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 751 HE 009 330

AUTHOR Johnston, Thomas E.
TITLE Role of the State in Planning and Coordination of Autonomous Institutions of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; Educational Accountability; *Educational History; Federal Legislation; *Government Role; *Higher Education; Planning; *State Boards of Education; *State Government; Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The development of external planning for colleges and universities as a function of state government is continuing to evolve. It is an area in which the role and responsibilities of the state and of the institutions are frequently matters of contention. Several reasons have been given for this state interest: the growth of state government, the increasing complexity of higher education, and more widespread interest in college and university education. Centralization of control of public higher education has increased from twelve states in 1932 to all states at present. The state role can be traced from the normal school movement in the 1830's and 1840's, through the Morrill Land Grant Act and the G.I. bill to the present development of state coordinating boards. The significance of the statewide coordinating board is that it represents a structure that can address the issues of postsecondary education while reasonably accommodating the historical role of public higher education and providing state government with sufficient assurance of accountability. A list of references is included. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED145751

ROLE OF THE STATE IN PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF AUTONOMOUS INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THOMAS E. JOHNSTON

HE009330

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mich. Dept of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

August 1977

CONTENTS

Introduction.....1

The Development of Statewide Coordination and Planning of Higher Education in the United States.....3

The Development of Statewide Coordination and Planning of Higher Education in Michigan.....16

Advantages and Disadvantages of Statewide Coordinating Boards.....26

Conclusions.....30

References.....34

INTRODUCTION

John Millett wrote that one of the major characteristics of our time is the extent to which planning is now being undertaken external to individual colleges and universities.[1] He concludes that federal and state agencies make studies, form commissions and inquire about government policy affecting higher education and that these activities may subsequently affect legislative or administrative action.[2] As examples of external planning at the state level, Millett cites State Departments of Education which have been designated as the agencies responsible for the preparation of master plans for public policy on higher education (California State Department of Education, 1960; Illinois Board of Higher Education, 1964; Michigan State Board of Education, 1969; Ohio Board of Regents, 1966; University of the State of New York, 1965.) Among the concerns that he believes are the most important subjects of higher education planning in recent years are quality of instruction, access to higher education, the scope of undergraduate and graduate programs of study, the extent of continuing education activity and the extent of research activity.[3] The development of external planning for colleges and universities as a function of state government is continuing to evolve and is an area in which the role and

responsibilities of the state and of the institutions are frequently matters of contention. Therefore, it would be useful for understanding the present to briefly review the nature and character of the development of statewide coordination and planning of higher education in the United States and in the State of Michigan.

The Development of Statewide Coordination and Planning of Higher Education in the United States

Several reasons are suggested in the literature to account for the ongoing interest in the development of statewide coordination and planning of higher education by public agencies. Glenny states that there are essentially two, the growth of state government and the increasing complexity of higher education.[4] Corson, in reference to the early development of American higher education, observes that institutions were "subjected" to the influence of external groups (church, alumni, donors, agricultural and business groups, government and others) in matters of program and policies during their first century and a half of existence.[5] In regard to the present situation of external pressure upon colleges and universities, Corson says the following:

> The reason is clear. The institution of Higher Education has become more central to the interests of more groups in the society than ever before. As the volume of new knowledge has increased, knowledge has become essential to a larger and larger proportion of the population. And the university, being in the business of discovering, accumulating, and transmitting knowledge, has been moved from the sidelines where it educated a few to the center of the social scene where it educates many, and where many other institutions within the society - the farm, the elementary and secondary schools, government and business, and the professions - come for workers trained in the professions and paraprofessions, and for aid in applying knowledge to the problems of society.[6]

Moos and Rourke note that the concept of coordination and unification can be traced back to 1785 with the establishment of the State Board of Regents in New York and to 1785 with the chartering of the University of Georgia.[7] Their study indicates that the movement of state centralization of higher education was initiated in 1896 with the creation of a single board of control over the public colleges and universities in South Dakota.[8]

Centralized control or supervision of public higher education by state government has increased from twelve states in 1932, according to Jamrich,[9] to every state currently having a board or commission and staff which is by constitution, statue or executive order responsible in some degree for higher education in the state.[10]

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in its report The Capitol and the Campus, provided some understanding as to why state government control and supervision of public higher education has increased when it reported:

> Among governmental units, the states have had the primary responsibility for the development of higher education throughout the history of the United States; before independence, this responsibility was carried by the colonies beginning with the support given to Harvard in 1636 by the Massachusetts Bay Colony.[11]

The Commission Report acknowledged the effectiveness of state sponsorship of higher education when it stated:

> That this responsibility generally has been well discharged is demonstrated by the quantitative and qualitative growth that has given this country a position of world leadership in higher education. The state, in the 1960's in particular, gave spectacular support to higher education in the face of a "tidal wave" of students. Their greatest previous contribution came about a century ago when the land-grant universities were being born.[12]

From another portion of the report:

> They (the states) have done well with it. Their guardianship has led to substantial diversity, to adaptation to regional needs, and to competitive efforts at improvement.[13]

Lastly, with respect to the matter of institutional autonomy, the Commission observed that state involvement and supervision of public colleges and universities is a legitimate but sensitive responsibility by concluding that:

> Autonomy of institutions of higher education neither can be nor should be complete. The public has clear interests in their conduct. However, too often and too increasingly, autonomy is being infringed upon beyond the requirements of protecting the essential interests of the public. We suggest the limits which should be placed on external governmental interference in the internal life of the campus. As private colleges become increasingly public assisted, the establishment of such limits becomes of even greater importance. At the same time, we recognize that autonomy is to be earned by conduct, as well as claimed by right. The campus earns its autonomy as it preserves its

> intellectual independence from attack from within, as well as from without; as it provides high-quality instruction, research, and services; as it prevents use of its resources for electoral political purposes and commercial activities unrelated to its educational functions; as it maintains vitality and flexibility; and as it respects the democratic processes of society, as much as it demands respect for its own academic freedom.[14]

Aside from the historical role of state responsibility for public higher education and the accompanying rationale for institutional supervision, the impetus for the growth of state planning and coordination may be the result of pressures more related to pragmatic features and logistical needs arising from social change than from the precedents and contexts of the past. For example, the number of colleges and universities have increased more than one hundred percent since 1900, institutional income has risen to more than three hundred times the amount it was at the beginning of the twentieth century, enrollment has more than doubled in every decade of this century, state expenditures in support of public higher education since 1900 have risen from slightly over $.02 billion to exceed $2.1 billion, and federal aid to institutions, programs and students, both directly and through state agencies has grown extensively during the past three decades of this century.[15] Thus the magnitude of current governmental support to public higher education and the complexity of the institutions and their operating missions and needs have given rise to state level concerns for accountability, equality of opportunity and access.

The states responded to public pressure for closer supervision of colleges and universities through the establishment of several forms of control and mechanisms for exercising state authority. Coordination of the separate elements which comprise public higher education within a state requires a mechanism or technique by which the participants can work "together toward some purpose that cannot be achieved by isolated, individual actions."[16] In his 1971 book, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Robert O. Berdahl set forth the following typology for classifying the types of state coordinating agencies currently in use:

I. States which have neither a single coordinating agency created by statute nor a voluntary association performing a significant statewide coordinating function.

II. States in which voluntary statewide coordination is performed by the institutions themselves operating with some degree of formality.

III. States which have a statewide coordinating board created by statute but not superseding institutional or segmental governing boards. This category is divided into the following subtypes:

   A. A board composed in the majority of institutional representatives and having essentially advisory powers.

   B. A board composed entirely or in the majority of public members and having essentially advisory powers.

   C. A board composed entirely or in the majority of public members and having regulatory powers in certain areas without, however, having governing responsibility for the institutions under its jurisdiction.

IV. States which have a single governing board, whether functioning as the governing body for the only public senior institution in the state or as a consolidated governing board for multiple institutions, with no local or segmental bodies.[17]

Millard states that the reasons for the differences among such bodies are readily apparent.[18] Individual college and university boards of trustees originate with the founding of these institutions, he notes, but state level boards for the planning and coordination of higher education are, with the few exceptions previously identified, are comparatively new agencies.[19] The growth of education during the nineteenth and up to the beginning of the twentieth century with the advent of compulsory school laws was primarily at the elementary and secondary levels. State level interest in public education was reflected through state departments of education which were charged with insuring that standards for instruction and other purposes were being met by the local school districts. As Millard observed, state response to higher education was different because up to the middle of the present century private institutions provided the majority of higher education instruction and services in the United States.[20] Early efforts in public higher education were directed at the development of normal schools or colleges to train and prepare teachers for elementary and secondary schools. Berdahl also

points out that the traditional college-age population up to 1900 was small as compared to the same age group of today's population and only four percent of the college-age population attended college prior to 1900.[21] Another factor which affected the nature of state government involvement in public higher education is that postsecondary or higher education has never been compulsory as had elementary and to a limited extent secondary education.[22] Questions and concerns which arose during the 1950's regarding equality of educational opportunity and access to public higher education stimulated state and federal government involvement to address the educational needs and interests of all citizens who desired education beyond high school.

Most sources in the literature of higher education agree that first major state role in public higher education was the support and development in the 1830's and 1840's of the normal school movement for teacher preparation. These institutions differed substantially in terms of curriculum, students bodies, and instructional objectives from the traditional classically oriented colleges of that time. One of the significant outcomes of state development of teacher training schools was the expansion of educational opportunity for higher learning to a broader spectrum of society. In respect to later state activities to plan and

coordinate public higher education, the development of the normal schools provided the foundation from which state colleges and university systems would be erected, as these schools became teachers colleges, state colleges and regional universities.[23]

The next significant governmental action in public higher education was taken by Congress in 1862 when it passed the Morrill Land Grant Act. The Morrill Land Grant Act (amended in 1890 and and extended in 1935) provided or made public land available to the states for the establishment of colleges which taught the mechanical and agricultural arts as well as the liberal arts. Many of the present state universities and state university systems are the institutions which began as state colleges of agriculture. The Morrill Act, as did the normal school movement, increased access to higher education for citizens as a direct result of federal and state government initiatives.

The enactment of the "G.I. Bill" by Congress following World War II resulted in enrollment expansion in public colleges and universities as well as in private and other institutions of post-secondary education. The G.I. Bill contributed to the growth of public institutions and to the social pressures exerted upon state government to make higher education available to more citizens. As Millard and others have pointed out, that after the second world war, higher education became the perceived vehicle for up-

ward mobility in American society.[24] During the late 1940's and into the 1950's and 1960's more citizens were attending institutions of higher education than ever before in the history of the United States. The desire for higher education for oneself and for ones children became an important social concern in the postwar period and continued to intensify to the present day.

During the 1950's, enrollments in public colleges and universities began to exceed enrollments in private institutions of higher education. Prior to 1950, sixteen states had taken action to centralize the governance of their public institutions and several other states had created boards or agencies to coordinate the growth of public higher education.[25] Before 1900, three states had established consolidated governing boards for the control and supervision of public institutions of higher education (Montana 1889, Nevada 1846 and South Dakota 1897) and by 1970 the number of states with consolidated governing boards had increased to nineteen with five such boards being created during the 1960's (Maine 1968, New Hampshire 1963, Rhode Island 1969, Utah 1969 and West Virginia 1969).[26] The majority of the states which established centralized governing bodies for public higher education were, according to Berdahl, states with limited financial resources and small numbers of institutions, public and private, and whose intent was:

> to control such premature expansion and proliferation by creating one single consolidated board for higher education and, at the same time, abolishing any existing local governing boards where necessary. Some of these consolidated boards particularly in Georgia (1931), Iowa (1909) and Oregon (1929) - moved aggressively to reduce program duplication; in Georgia, the agency founded in the depression year of 1931 eliminated 10 institutions.[27]

Interest in statewide coordination and planning of higher education which surfaced in the years immediately following World War II increased during the 1950's and 1960's as evidenced by the establishment of several coordinating boards and the development of numerous voluntary coordinating structures. The upsurge in enrollments continued as veterans were replaced by students from the so-called "baby-boom" and later by citizens not usually associated with the traditional college attending segment of the population. Halstead noted that the most "preferred agency" adopted by states to coordinate higher education during the post-World War II period was the statewide coordinating board.[28] Under the direction of a coordinating board, statewide planning and coordination was provided without discontinuing the operations of the elected or appointed institutional governing boards. The popularity of this form of "superboard" state agency resulted from its ability to be easily established by statute and its relative acceptability to colleges and universities because they were able to maintain local initiative and autonomy which would not be the situation under a state governing board.[29] Prior to

1950, only two states had established statewide coordinating boards (Kentucky in 1934 and Oklahoma in 1941). However, twenty-five states created such agencies during the two decades following 1950.

Seven states had voluntary coordinating bodies or associations during the 1950's, but because of structural problems and lack of member cooperation, it has declined in number to presently only two states - Nebraska and Delaware - which maintain this form of agency.[30] Millard concluded that voluntary coordinating mechanisms were developed and supported primarily by public college and university presidents who recognized the pressure for coordination was increasing from the states and saught some form of arrangement which would serve both the state and the institution.[31] The effectiveness of voluntary coordinating associations was seriously eroded by their dependency upon institutions to cooperate and, in turn, abide by positions and views supported a majority of the membership. When interests of individual members were in competition, the voluntary arrangements of these bodies were not sufficient to resolve the conflict nor impose a solution.[32] Most authors in the literature concurred that the major outcome of voluntary coordinating associations was the preservation of the status-quo.[33]

The response of state governments to the pressures exerted upon them during the 1950's and 1960's for additional facilities, programs and institutions to meet the demands of enrollment growth was favorable to higher education. Now state officials must respond to the need for a balance between public concerns regarding accountability, existing and additional institutional requests for support and other social priorities for resource allocation. A more frequent response to the problem by states has been, as Millard observes:

> in the direction of increasing the role or power of such boards (coordinating and consolidated governing agencies) and in some cases substituting for a coordinating structure a consolidated governing board structure.[34]

The literature dealing with statewide coordination and planning supports the existence of the trend toward the development of state systems of coordination and centralized governing of public higher education. Further, of the states which have adopted such coordinating and governing boards none have reduced the responsibilities or powers of these agencies but in three states the advisory role of the coordinating board has been changed to the regulatory authority of a governing board (Maine, Utah and West Virginia). Because states do change and alter mechanisms for the coordination and planning of public higher education, indicates that policy

makers within state government and the institutions reach different conclusions regarding the nature and role of statewide boards and that those conclusions regarding the nature and role of statewide boards are subject to modification over time. Millard posed the following four considerations which policy makers must address on a recurrent basis:

1. What is the appropriate structure?
2. Is the existing structure adequate to meet the needs of the state as perceived by legislators, governors, institutions and the general public?
3. Can a single governing agency be more responsive in areas of accountability, efficiency, and in decreasing duplication, competition, and in-fighting in the post-secondary or higher education community?
4. Could a single board for all higher education be even more effective?[35]

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATEWIDE COORDINATION AND
PLANNING OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

Moos and Rourke commented in their book, The Campus and the State, that "finding the proper position for public institutions of higher education within the over-all scheme of state government is an old problem."[36] They note that in the nineteenth century, state governments and institutions were involved in disputes concerning the legitimacy of certain controls over the colleges and universities which the states had established. As examples of early state and campus disagreement, they cite nineteenth century litigation involving Michigan courts and dealing with issues which would appear to have merit for all those policy makers currently engaged in the decision making process of public higher education in Michigan. They report early litigation dealt with issues such as how far a legislature may legally attach conditions to funds appropriated for support of a state university.[37] Other cases of the time focused upon the appropriateness of attempts by state fiscal officers to manage institutional expenditures from the appropriations authorized by the legislature. Concensus regarding the proper balance between the controls of higher education by the state and the fears of institutional leadership for the loss of authority have been raised throughout the history of the state.

In recent years, as Moos and Rourke have reported in relation to other states, state government in Michigan has been moving gradually toward centralized administration of public colleges and universities as a result of the appropriations process, capital outlay needs, information requirements, academic program review and approval, and other state level operational procedures. The basis for the gradual movement of state government toward centralized administrative control was described by John Dale Russell in a survey of higher education in Michigan which he directed in 1958 for a committee of the legislature.[38] In recommending "that the Legislature take immediate steps to create and establish a board for the coordination of the state-controlled program of higher education in Michigan"[39], the Russell study presented several reasons why, in 1958, the necessity existed for higher education to be coordinated by a state agency. Among the general needs cited in the study which were offered in support of the establishment of a coordinating body for Michigan were the following statements:

> The sum of the pressures from the individual institutions and from the citizens of the communities in which they are located does not necessarily add up to the best possible program of service for the entire state, within the limits of the funds that can be made available. Almost invariably some institutions are more aggressive than others in urging their needs for support and development. Some institutions may be overly modest or even negligent in presenting their cases. Areas of the state in which no institution is presently located usually have no spokesman to make effective pleas for needed services. Thus, the program

> of the state is likely to be spotty, highly developed or even over-developed in some centers, while meagerly supported or even non-existent in others.[40]

In respect to specific justifications for the establishment of a statewide coordinating board in Michigan, the Russell study made several observations about the nature and conduct of public higher education as it then functioned in Michigan.[41] The study stated that the public colleges and universities were no longer small and simple in their organization nor few in number that would permit the Legislature to do the necessary coordination through its actions on appropriations requests. Additionally, other support needs and responsibilities of state government had also evolved into large and complex agencies, organizations and problems, such as highways, corrections, social services, health, agriculture and others. Because of the complexity of state government and intense demand for allocated support, it had become, according to the study, impossible for the Legislature to give "detailed attention and consideration" to the requests submitted by the institutions for operating appropriations. The problem is emphasized further because of the short periods of legislative session, changing membership of the House and Senate, and the shifts of committee assignment all of which mitigate against the membership of the Legislature becoming "reasonably familiar" with the detailed needs and requests of each institution.

Aside from the increase in state government complexity and responsibilities, the institutions themselves were of concern to Russell and his staff, and also provided a basis for supporting the contention that a coordinating body was needed in Michigan.[42] As had state government, the study reported, the institutions of public higher education had also grown in size and complexity. Multiple programs of instruction, research, and public service were being maintained and adequate methods for evaluating, particularly the research and public service functions for support purposes, were not yet available.

Simply put, the Russell study stated that "the resources of the state are usually not sufficiently elastic to meet all the growing needs for support, as presented by the various operational units."[43] In order for the state to make the decisions for allocation of support so that the distribution will result in "greatest benefit" for the state in the maintenance of its higher education programs, a high degree of professional knowledge and skill is required. At the time the study was issued, noted Russell, it was a "difficult" and "complicated" task for make accurate projections of the funds needed by each institution to operate on "comparable levels of effectiveness."[44]

The next most recent event affecting the development of statewide coordination and planning of higher education in Michigan was the framing and adoption of the present State of Michigan Constitution in 1963. Article VIII (Education) of the 1963 Michigan Constitution restricts and limits statewide coordination and planning of allocated resources for higher education by granting autonomy to public colleges and universities.[45] The State Board of Education was charged by the Constitution to serve "as the general planning and coordinating body for all public education, including higher education, and shall advise the legislature as to the financial requirements in connection therewith."[46] The role of both the autonomous public colleges and universities and of the State Board of Education as the general planning and coordinating body for all public education was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.[47] However, the seemingly contradictory nature of these two constitutionally designated roles was not clarified by the Court's decision and hence, different interpretations have emerged as to the implementation of these two roles with regard to specific issues in public higher education in Michigan.

In 1969, the State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan was approved by the State Board of Education. In terms of the development of statewide coordination and planning of higher education in

Michigan, the significance of the State Plan, and other such plans according to Halstead, was that it paralleled more recent activities in the development of state coordinating systems and that the document resulted from centralized planning efforts and state studies such as the John Dale Russell study previously discussed.[48] Halstead makes the distinction between a survey (as in the John Dale Russell study) and a statewide or "master" plan with regard to their scope and focus. He states that the survey is essentially directed at "inspection and fact gathering", while the State Plan includes those features, makes recommendations and presents a plan for action.[49] Further, the survey is generally descriptive and limited in scope as compared to the state or master plan which is usually interpretative and gives direction for future policy as well as being comprehensive in scope.[50] The State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan conforms to all the distinctions that Halstead and others have associated with master plans.[51] In a concluding statement of Chapter III of the State Plan, the State Board of Education provides some indication as to how it interprets and views its role as the coordinating and planning body for Michigan higher education when it stated:

> Michigan's total system of higher education, as described in Chapter I, is large, complex, and diverse. The need for a rational program of planning and coordination is clear. Such planning, of course, is based on the collection and analysis of adequate information on the existing programs of all institutions, public and private, two and four year. In addition, the

> coordinating agency must be involved in the decisions to provide additional educational services. The State Board of Education is the agency designated to perform this role.
>
> In fulfilling its important function of planning and coordination, the State Board of Education considers its role to be a supportive one which can contribute to strengthening the total commitment to higher education.[52]

In 1972, as a result of the passage of the amendments that year to the Federal Higher Education Act of 1966, Governor Milliken designated the State Board of Education as the agency responsible for postsecondary education planning in accordance with Section 1202 of the Amendments. The 1972 Education Amendments mandated that states establish postsecondary education commissions through designation of existing agencies, expanding the scope of existing agencies, or by creating new agencies.[53] As the designated "1202" Commission for Michigan, the State Board of Education established a State Council on Postsecondary Education, as provided for in Section 1203 of the Amendments, to advise the State Board on issues pertaining to the entire spectrum of postsecondary education. The membership of the Council on Postsecondary Education includes representatives of the general public, public and private institutions, proprietary schools, and state government.

Governor William G. Milliken established the Commission on Higher Education in December, 1972, and charged the Commission with the following three responsibilities:

1. To assess and, when necessary, redefine the goals, purposes and the functions of post-secondary education in Michigan as well as the instructional delivery systems required to carry out such purposes;

2. To determine and make appropriate recommendations concerning needed procedures and structures for the proper governance, planning and coordination of postsecondary education in Michigan;

3. To determine and make needed recommendations on the means required to provide most equitably for the financial needs of postsecondary education in Michigan in the years to come.[54]

In 1974, the Governor's Commission on Higher Education issued its final report in which it recommended that "the Michigan Constitution be revised to provide for the creation by statute of a separate State Board of Postsecondary Education."[55] In terms of the responsibilities of the new state board, the Commission proposed that it be charged with "the general planning and coordination of all education beyond the secondary level, with advisory and recommendatory, rather than mandatory, authority."[56] The Governor, in his 1976 and 1977 Michigan State of the State Messages, proposed legislation as a result of the commission report which would put on the ballot for citizen approval a proposal for a Constitutional Amendment creating a separate State Board of Higher Education.[57] The Legislature, to date, has not enacted the Governor's proposals.

Another recent event which has had an influence on the development of statewide coordination and planning of higher education in Michigan was the establishment of the Michigan Efficiency Task Force in 1976 by Governor Milliken. The Task Force was formed as a result of a recommendation made to the Governor's office by a committee of the legislature (Budget Efficiency and Savings to Taxpayers Committee, under the leadership of Senators John C. Hertel and Patrick H. McCollough). In making its recommendation to the Governor, the legislative committee reported that it felt that a complete "analysis of state budgets and programs, with emphasis on administrative efficiency by eliminating duplications and terminating marginal activities, could lead to savings which, in turn, could minimize tax increases which would otherwise be necessary."[58]

In its report of findings and recommendations, the Task Force after evaluating public higher education in Michigan, observed that the colleges and universities are autonomous with respect to both academic affairs and operational activities. The evaluation stated further that "optimum utilization of state educational funds requires a long-range plan of coordination."[59] Subsequently, the first recommendation made by the task force in the section addressing public institutions and their operation recommends the establish-

ment of a planning authority for higher education.[60] The recommendation of the Task Force was based on its view that optimum utilization of the state's financial resources requires centralized planning to identify long-range requirements and program needs while maintaining the high quality of the institutions. The recommendation was accompanied by alternatives for implementation which, as yet, have not been acted upon.

The final point in relation to the development of statewide coordination and planning of higher education in Michigan is the continuing effort of state government to develop and implement a formula funding mechanism for the determination of appropriated support to colleges and universities. For the past three years, the Legislature, primarily through the Senate and House Fiscal Agencies, has committee staff and resources to the generation and refinement of a criterion based formula funding model. The import of the state funding project with respect to coordination and planning of higher education is that such a model, if implemented for appropriations purposes, prioritizes institutions, service functions, and programs which inadvertently achieves a form of state-level administrative coordination and planning of operations not directly possible under the provisions of the Constitution.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF STATEWIDE COORDINATING BOARDS

In the literature of statewide coordination and planning of higher education, several general points are mentioned and discussed in support of the establishment or continuance of coordinating boards. Typical of the many general statements is the following view put forth by a task force of the Education Commission of the States:

> The most effective way to avoid direct political interference in an institution is by developing, through planning and cooperation, the rationale and structure to ensure that it is meeting basic social and educational needs . . . From this standpoint, mature and effective planning and coordination are the best defenses of reasonable institutional independence, rather than a threat to it.[61]

Glenny and others have suggested that statewide coordinating boards are more effective structures for integrating and dealing with the large numbers of decisions, professional staffs and levels of hierarchies necessary for contemporary long-range and operational planning.[62] The "one great paramount advantage" of the coordinating board over a statewide governing board, observes Glenny, is its ability to perform as an "umbrella" under which the various commissions, agencies, institutions and advisory groups involving higher education may be located for state coordination and planning purposes.[63]

In regard to more specific and politically pragmatic reasons for supporting the statewide coordinating structure, Millard asserts that there are four areas of recurring concern to policy makers in institutions and in state government.[64] According to Millard, these four "tension" areas standout (1) control versus autonomy, (2) centralization versus decentralization, (3) fear of uniformity of instruction and services, and (4) the lack of clarity between different levels of administrative responsibility.[65] In the context of retrenchment, Millard believes that the central issue related to autonomy is whether decisions to consolidate, curtail or discontinue programs should be made by a state coordinating board in cooperation with colleges and universities or should be directed by legislative or executive degree.[66] He concludes that the cooperative decision-making structure presented by the coordinating board is more in concert with the preservation of institutional independence and academic integrity than is the alternative of legislative or executive decree.

After noting the trend toward centralization during the past sixteen years and the dangers inherent in over-centralization, he offers the following list of "countervailing factors" to over-centralization:

--The need in planning and coordination for the development of more effective management information systems tends to reinforce centralization;

--Neither planning nor coordination can be effective for long if the process does not include the integral involvement of the institutions and agencies planned for;

--Centralization in relation to overview is also frequently accompanied by the recognition of the importance of decentralization, both for segmental development in the planning process and for implementation;

--The third alternative would be to take planning and coordination away from the levels of a board of agency primarily responsible for and usually representative of postsecondary education and lodge it either directly in the legislative or executive branch of government or in a planning agency for all state affairs, where education would be viewed as only another competing priority;

--State Boards should be given powers commensurate with the functions they are required to perform; without such powers, institutions will engage in circumventive activities.[67]

In regard to the concern that statewide coordinating boards tend to encourage uniformity among programs and instructional services, Millard states that the opposite of homogenization is more aptly to be the outcome from the actions of coordinating agencies. He argues that the "major thrust" of coordinating boards has been in the area of assisting in the definition of institutional role and mission and helping to preserve and foster "institutional uniqueness and interinstitutional complementarity."[68]

According to Millard, lack of clarity involving levels of decision making between state boards and colleges and universities constitutes the most difficult and serious area of tension.[69] Uncertainty as to who has the responsibility for making decisions in terms of the various issues and problems has contributed to the operating problems and undermined the working relationship of several coordinating boards and institutions. All the parties involved, Millard believes, should clearly understand the structure of the decision making process in whatever form it exists.[70]

The significance of the statewide coordinating board, in respect to the authors' views which were discussed in this section, is that is represents a structure which can address the issues presently confronting postsecondary education while reasonably accommodating the historical role of public higher education and providing state government with sufficient assurance of accountability. The alternatives to such an agency, cited by Millard, Glenny, Berdahl and others, would be a continuance of interinstitutional competition or direct legislative or executive involvement in response to political and public pressures.

CONCLUSIONS

The need for statewide coordination and planning of autonomous public institutions of higher education in Michigan has been recognized by the recent studies and commissions as noted in this document. The findings of the various study groups and commissions were based upon the involvement and participation of representatives of the state, public colleges and universities, experts and specialists in field of higher education, the business community, and the general public. Additionally, the need for statewide coordination and planning of higher education was affirmed by the 1963 Constitution of the State of Michigan which designated the State Board of Education as the body responsible for such planning and coordination. The State Supreme Court (in the Salmon Decision) upheld the constitutionally prescribed autonomous status of public institutions of higher education and the mandated charge to the State Board of Education that it shall serve as the general planning and coordinating body for higher education.

The present nature of statewide coordination and planning of higher education in Michigan has evolved from the historical role certain institutions, legal interpretation, legislative

initiatives and interests, concerns of educational leaders and to some extent action taken by the executive branch of state government. The conduct of coordination and planning continues to be a dynamic process changing in relation to the economic condition of state, the perceived merits of educational issues, public priorities for state support and the strength and influence of the institutions, their representatives and state government officials. That this dynamic process assisted the state through its public colleges and universities in addressing the higher education needs of most of the state's citizens encouraged by the social and educational changes of the past three decades is evident. It is doubtful, given the favorable dispostion toward higher education of the Legislature and the public during the period following World War II through the mid-1960's, that the expansion of higher education in Michigan during this period would have proceeded differently if it had been directed by a coordinating board or a consolidated governing board. The need and demand for higher education was great during the years after the Second World War and the State acknowledged its responsibility and responded to meet the identified needs of its citizens.

However, it is also doubtful that the preservation of high quality and in some instances developing programs and institutional soundness can be achieved most effectively by continuing the ad

hoc and reactive planning process as the state enters a protracted period of stability and possible decline of enrollments and support needs for public higher education. The challenge facing the colleges and universities and the state is not just the preservation of individual programs and institutions through the remainder of this century, but it is also the responsibility to meet the postsecondary education needs of Michigan's citizens in the next century with a high quality and comprehensive educational system. In order to respond to the problems of public higher education for the next two decades and to insure the integrity and soundness of the existing comprehensive postsecondary education programs continues to be available for citizens in the future a more deliberate and forward-looking approach to statewide coordination and planning is needed.

The mechanism which would appear to be the most appropriate for Michigan in assuming a more deliberate and responsible approach to coordination and planning needs is that of a statewide coordinating board. Its effectiveness, as the literature reviewed noted and as the problems of stability or decline portend, depend upon a role and authority which is more than advisory but

rather includes the legal authority to implement its analitically and carefully arrived at decisions. To proceed with the state's present approach to coordination and planning into an extended period of retrenchment invites consequences to institutions, programs and, hence, to citizens which will not serve the best interests of public higher education or the State of Michigan.

REFERENCES

[1]John D. Millett, "College and University Administration", Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Fourth Edition (Robert Ebel, Editor) (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969) p. 163

[2]Millett, p. 163

[3]Millett, p. 163

[4]Lyman A. Glenny, Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenges of Coordination (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

[5]John J. Corson, The Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) p. 22.

[6]Corson, p. 22-23

[7]Malcolm Moos and Francis Rourke, The Campus and the State (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959).

[8]Moos and Rourke (also see John X. Jamrich, "Cooperation, Coordination, and Control in Higher Education", Encylopedia of Educational Research, Fourth Edition (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969) p. 206).

[9]Jamrich, p. 206.

[10]Richard M. Millard, State Boards of Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976) p. 4.

[11]The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Capitol and the Campus (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971) p. 1.

[12]Carnegie Commission, p. 1.

[13]Carnegie Commission, p. 1.

[14]Carnegie Commission, p. 5.

[15]Carnegie Commission, p. 23.

[16]Carnegie Commission, p. 24.

[17]Robert O. Berdahl, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971) pp. 18-23.

[18]Millard, p. 5.

[19]Millard, p. 5.

[20]Millard, p. 6.

[21]Berdahl, p. 28.

[22]Millard, p. 6.

[23]Millard, p. 6.

[24]Millard, p. 7.

[25]Berdahl, p. 18-23 (Table I).

[26]Berdahl, Table I.

[27]Berdahl, p. 27.

[28]Kent D. Halstead, Statewide Planning in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974) p. 8.

[29]Halstead, p. 8.

[30]Berdahl, Table I, and Halstead, p. 8.

[31]Millard, p. 10.

[32]Millard, p. 10, and Halstead, p. 9.

[33]Millard, p. 10, and Halstead, p. 9. (Also see John W. Minter, editor, Capital and Campus, (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966) p. 38).

[34]Millard, p. 12.

[35]Millard, p. 13.

[36]Malcolm Moos and Francis E. Rourke, The Campus and the State (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1959) Chapter III

[37]Moos and Rourke, Chapter III.

[38]John Dale Russell, Director, Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Michigan, Staff Study No. 12 (Lansing: Michigan Legislative Study Commission on Higher Education, 1958).

[39]Russell, p. 68 and 89.

[40]John Dale Russell, p. 28.

[41]John Dale Russell, Chapter II, p. 27-40.

[42]John Dale Russell, p. 29.

[43]John Dale Russell, p. 29.

[44]John Dale Russell, p. 29.

[45]Michigan Constitution, Article VIII, Education, 1963.

[46]Michigan, Constitution, Article VIII, Section 3.

[47]Leonard E. Goodall, Editor, State Politics and Higher Education (Dearborn: LMB Associates, 1976) p. 1-39.

[48]Halstead, p. 9.

[49]Halstead, p. 11.

[50]Halstead, p. 11.

[51]See Lyman A. Glenny and George B. Weathersby, Editors, Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design (Boulder: N.C.H.E. M.S., 1971).

[52]Michigan Department of Education, The State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan (Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1969) p. 41.

[53]Millard, p. 13.

[54]Report of Governor's Commission on Higher Education, Building for the Future of Postsecondary Education in Michigan (Lansing: 1974) p. 1 and 2.

[55]Report of Governor's Commission on Higher Education, p. 10.

[56]Report of Governor's Commission on Higher Education, p. 11.

[57]Governor William G. Milliken, Michigan State of the State Message (Lansing: January, 1976) p. 36. And Governor William G. Milliken, Michigan State of the State Message (Lansing: January, 1977) p. 37.

[58]Michigan Efficiency Task Force, Summary Findings and Recommendations (Lansing: 1976) p. 1.

[59]Michigan Efficiency Task Force, p. 39.

[60]Michigan Efficiency Task Force, p. 39.

[61]Education Commission of the States, Coordination or Chaos?, Report of the Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Postsecondary Education (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973) p. 75.

[62]Lyman A. Glenny, Robert O. Berdahl, Ernest G. Palola and James G. Paltridge, Coordinating Higher Education for the '70's (Berkeley: C.R.D.H.E., University of California, 1971), p. 3.

[63]Glenny, et.al., p. 4.

[64]Millard, p. 50.

[65]Millard, p. 50.

[66]Millard, p. 52.

[67]Millard, p. 52-54.
[68]Millard, p. 55.
[69]Millard, p. 55.
[70]Millard, p. 55.